# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

POM OF PENNSYLVANIA, LLC, t/d/b/a PACE-O-MATIC, and SAVVY DOG SYSTEMS, LLC,

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00722-PLD

CONSOLIDATED with 2:18-CV-00941

Plaintiffs/Counterclaim Defendants,

v.

PENNSYLVANIA SKILL GAMES, LLC,

Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.

#### **VERDICT FORM**

Please follow all directions on this form. Begin with Question #1 and mark answers with an "X" on the corresponding line.

### TRADEMARK CLAIMS

#### **Word Trademark**

1.	PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark is valid and has acquired a secondary meaning in the marketplace through their efforts?
	Yes: No:
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2.
	If you answered "No" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 9.
2.	Who has established by a preponderance of the evidence that the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark is valid and has acquired a secondary meaning in the marketplace through their efforts?
	POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC:
	OR
	Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC:

If you answered "POM of Pennsylvania LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3.

If you answered "Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC" to Question 2 please proceed to Question 5.

3.	Have POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC infringed the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark under federal law (Lanham Act), the Pennsylvania Trademark Act and Pennsylvania common law?		
	Yes: No:		
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4.		
	If you answered "No," to Question 3, please proceed to Question 9.		
4.	Have POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC willfully infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark?		
	Yes: No:		
	Please proceed to Question 9.		
5.	Has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that POM of Pennsylvania, LLC, Savvy Dog Systems, LLC, Pace-O-Matic, Inc., or Miele Manufacturing, Inc. infringed the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark under federal law (Lanham Act) and Pennsylvania common law?		
	Yes: No:		
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 5, please proceed to Question 6.		
	If you answered "No" to Question 5, please proceed to Question 9.		
6.	Which party or parties have infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark?		
	Pace-O-Matic, Inc. POM of Pennsylvania, LLC Savvy Dog Systems, LLC Miele Manufacturing, Inc.		

Please proceed to Question 7. With respect to any party or parties who you found in Question 6 to have infringed on 7. the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark, has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence that any party or parties willfully infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" trademark? Yes: No: \_\_\_\_ If you answered "Yes" to Question 7, please proceed to Question 8. If you answered "No" to Question 7, please proceed to Question 9. Which party or parties willfully infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "word" 8. trademark? Pace-O-Matic, Inc. POM of Pennsylvania, LLC Savvy Dog Systems, LLC Miele Manufacturing, Inc. Please proceed to Question 9. **Design Trademark** Has any party established by a preponderance of the evidence that the 9. PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark is valid and is either inherently distinctive or has acquired a secondary meaning in the marketplace through their efforts?: Yes: \_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_ If you answered "Yes" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 10. If you answered "No" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 17. Who has established by a preponderance of the evidence that the PENNSYLVANIA 10. SKILL "design" trademark is valid and is either inherently distinctive or has acquired a secondary meaning in the marketplace through their efforts? POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC: OR Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC:

If you answered "POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC" to Question 10, please proceed to Question 11.

If you answered "Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC" to Question 10, please proceed to Question 13.

11.	Have POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC infringed the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark under federal law (Lanham Act), the Pennsylvania Trademark Act and Pennsylvania common law?		
	Yes: No:		
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 11, please proceed to Question 12.		
	If you answered "No" to Question 11, please proceed to Question 17.		
12.	Have POM of Pennsylvania, LLC and Savvy Dog Systems, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC willfully infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark?		
	Yes: No:		
	Please proceed to Question 17.		
13.	Has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that Pace-O-Matic, Inc, POM of Pennsylvania, LLC, Savvy Dog Systems, LLC or Miele Manufacturing, Inc. infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark under federal law (Lanham Act) and Pennsylvania common law?		
	Yes: No:		
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 13, please proceed to Question 14.		
	If you answered "No" to Question 13, please proceed to Question 17.		
14.	Which party or parties have infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark?		
	Pace-O-Matic, Inc. POM of Pennsylvania, LLC Savvy Dog Systems, LLC Miele Manufacturing, Inc.		

	Please proceed to Question 13.
15.	With respect to any party or parties who you found in Question 14 to have infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark, has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence that any party or parties willfully infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark?
	Yes: No:
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 15, please proceed to Question 16.
	If you answered "No" to Question 15, please proceed to Question 17.
16.	Which party or parties willfully infringed on the PENNSYLVANIA SKILL "design" trademark?
	Pace-O-Matic, Inc. POM of Pennsylvania, LLC Savvy Dog Systems, LLC Miele Manufacturing, Inc.
	Please proceed to Question 17.
	UNFAIR COMPETITION CLAIM
17.	Has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that POM of Pennsylvania, LLC, Savvy Dog Systems, LLC, Pace-O-Matic, Inc., or Miele Manufacturing, Inc. engaged in unfair competition?:
	Yes: No:
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 17, please proceed to Question 18.
	If you answered "No" to Question 17, please proceed to question 19.
18.	Which party or parties engaged in unfair competition?
	Pace-O-Matic, Inc. POM of Pennsylvania, LLC Savvy Dog Systems, LLC Miele Manufacturing, Inc.

Please proceed to Question 19.

## FALSE ADVERTISING CLAIM

19.	Has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that POM of Pennsylvania, LLC, Savvy Dog Systems, LLC, Pace-O-Matic, Inc., of Miele Manufacturing, Inc. engaged in false advertising?:
	Yes: No:
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 19, please proceed to Question 20.
	If you answered "No" to Question 19, please proceed to question 21.
20.	Which party or parties engaged in false advertising?
	Pace-O-Matic, Inc. POM of Pennsylvania, LLC Savvy Dog Systems, LLC Miele Manufacturing, Inc.
	Please proceed to Question 21.
	CONTRACT CLAIMS
21.	Is the Equipment Purchase Agreement still in effect today?
	Yes No:
	If you answered "Yes" to Question 21, please proceed to Question 23.
	If you answered "No" to Question 21, please proceed to Question 22.
22.	When did the Equipment Purchase Agreement end?
	Date:
	Please proceed to Question 23.
23.	Has Pennsylvania Skill Games, LLC established by a preponderance of the evidence that Pace-O-Matic, Inc., Miele Manufacturing, Inc. or POM of Pennsylvania, LLC breached the Equipment Purchase Agreement?:
	Yes: No:

	If you answered "Yes'	' to Question 23, please proceed to Question 24.
		to Question 23, your deliberations are now complete. tructions after Question 24.
24.	Which party or parties bre	ached the Equipment Purchase Agreement?
	Pace-O-Matic, Inc. Miele Manufacturing, POM of Pennsylvania,	
Your deli	iberations on the first phas	e of the trial are now complete. All jurors should sign the
verdict fo	orm in the spaces below ar	nd notify the Clerk that you have reached a verdict. The
Forepers	on should retain possession	n of the verdict form and bring it to the courtroom with
the jury.		
Dated	: 2/24/23	Foreperson  Wathlein Much
		OmyRonso
		El OSK
		Maluf 6
		They Pelers
		Barryan
		O Moore